

## Next Meeting: 3/20/07 IGCS Conference Room C

In attendance: Sheriff Mark Frisbie, Louise Anderson, Dean Babcock, Jeff Barber, Cathy Boggs, Linda Chezem (proxy: Kim Manlove), Mike Cunegin, Jason Hutchens, Lisa Hutcheson, Nancy Jewell (Proxy: Layla Baker), Mike Kramer (Proxy: Mark Frisbie/Jason Hutchens), Bob Levy, Tammy Loew, Heather McCarthy, Jim Noffsinger, Paula Parker-Sawyers, Tom Rugh, Karla Sneegas, Matt Strittmatter, Scott Tittle, Carolyn Waller, Dennis Wichern (Proxy: Kim Manlove, Gary Williams (Proxy: Marsha French), Marcia French, Jeanette Grissom, John Viernes, Harold Kooreman, Martha Payne, Chandan Saha, Neal Holt, Eric Wright

### **First. Welcome and Introduction of Member- Mark Frisbie**

- Introductions of all GAC Members
- Review of 11/21 minutes, Minutes approved

### **Second. Project Staffing Report John V**

- Due to the difficulty to fill the administration position for SPF-SIG, it has been proposed to reroute these monies to utilize the opportunity for more ICJI consultant staff.
- This amounts to \$50,000 total that would be spent for consultants
- Bob levy addresses the issue of funds within the SPF-SIG and how the unspent money would be allocated.
- \$2.3 million total could only budget each fiscal year. However, CSAP told DMHA said that unspent dollars would be eligible to be moved forward each year.
- John Viernes: Motion to approve the use of \$50,000 budgeted amount to be used for the acquisition of new ICJI consultant staff and not for SPF-SIG clerical staff position. Motion Approved.

### **Third. Financial Review Tom Turney**

- \$528 spent in staff area no other reported expenses

### **Fourth. Evaluation workgroup Bob Levy**

- Since last GAC meeting Process Evaluations have been at all SPF-SIG related meetings and events.
- In preparation for the grant awardees and fund distribution phase, evaluation of this process will be discussed at the next meeting.
- Note: SEOW is independent of the SPF-SIG. This will exist beyond the SPF-SIG monies as shown by the flow chart hand out. This mechanism is in place in order to maintain data infrastructure efforts for the state of Indiana.
- The SEOW work has already shown support from other workgroups and organizations ex: has shown approval by the MFI group.

- Community readiness survey has been electronic distributed 1500 copies already; 600 targeted to get returned
- Community indicator document- If a community wishes to apply for a grant they need to be consistent. This means that data needs to be consistent throughout the community and the state. If you are to use another data source, certain standards and expectations will be put in place by the SEOW.
- The idea of data also addresses the non funded communities and the non funded priorities. They will have the SEOW data at their disposal to utilize to build their infrastructure and begin seeking outside grants beyond the SPF-SIG (this can should also be done by SPF-SIG awardees)
- Karla Sneegas spoke about her ITPC Director of Evaluation who has done work on process indicators and is happy to share. This entire system is online.

**Fifth. Paula Parker-Sawyers Training & Outreach**

- The Workgroup meets weekly
- The SPF-SIG “ rollout” schedule has been pushed back by CSAP delays but the structure is in place; similar to the “roll out of SPF-SIG” handout
- CSAP/PIRE Meeting Update
  1. 7 regional trainings was not fiscally sound with the amount of anticipated participation. The number of trainings has now been reduced to three regional trainings
    - north, south, central
- The newsletter will be available later this week. It will include upcoming events, listing of GAC members, quote from Mitch Roob. The Newsletter will be distributed to mass email via point people. **GAC Participation is STRONGLY ENCOURAGED in this effort!**

**Sixth. Jeff Barber Grant Review**

- Will meet next week with Kim to discuss CSAP communication
- Once CSAP approval is given there will be more concrete progress

**Seventh. Jason Hutchens**

- July 1 2007 will be the deadline for getting contracts out or the money will not be able to be distributed.
- Originally 6 priorities were set up: State wide Focuses and Community Focuses
- After reviewing this, CSAP firmly stated that this many priorities would not get approved.
- Because of this, The Pacific Institute of Research and Evaluation came to Indiana to provide TA on the priorities

- What were presented were methodologies to narrow the focus in the assessment and planning phase at the state level.
- End Result of PIRE meeting
  1. Keep alcohol as the statewide initiative
  2. Executive committee approved 3 priorities: cocaine 20%, meth20% and statewide alcohol 60% all data driven aspects
- Reasoning behind Changes to the Priorities (see “Selection of SPF SIG target Priorities” handout)
  1. Utilized the aspects of measurement suggested by PIRE
    - What are the existing capacity/resources?
    - What is the level of Preventability & changeability?
    - Is there Community Readiness/ Political will?
- Counties were ranked using UCR data- those ranking in the top 10% were recognized as “High Need”, “High Capacity” was also measured.
- If a county was not recognized in the top 10% it does not preclude them from applying. They would just need to identify their specific need, beyond the county rankings that Dr. Wright’s team has put together.

**Eighth. Dr. Wright**

- SEOW reviewed process immediately following the PIRE meeting
- Application of data driven logic to the communities needed to be in place
- Capacity is equal to how much infrastructure currently exists
- Community Readiness: you may want to run an intervention but the community may not be receptive or ready for the task
- Capacity was rated across the 6 priorities
  1. Review pie chart hand out
  2. Tobacco was eliminated because of it was financially backed already, its receiving political attention (i.e.: tobacco tax)
  3. Prescriptions were taken off because there is no current infrastructure to support it with the limited funds available.
  4. It would also be a hard case to make to evenly distribute the funds 1/3 each because of the data (alcohol has a disproportional skew comparative to meth and cocaine)
  5. SEOW data should be utilized and diversified into other policy making venues beyond SPF-SIG and the SEOW can support all the functions of these venues.
  6. Where do we want to strategically place the money to prevent Substance Use?

7. Financial Breakdown of the grants: \$1.9 million each year, \$136,000 per grant if 10 grants are given out

- The overall allocation will be also based on the quality of the application submitted. Grants will not be distributed based on the percentage amounts. For example, if RFS applications are poor or low in number, alcohol may not get 60%, but 50% of the funding.
- Reminder: this is a 5 year process and there may be more than 10 grants
- Even a SPF-SIG year 1 awardee will have to do a planning grant as well, even if they have received a SPF-SIG grant in the past. *No one* will be jumping into program development. These are new tools that the former SPF did not have available to them.
- Some counties may go through the SPF-SIG process faster than others.
- LLCs and community consultants will need to be connected with these organizations and will need to build a partnership in order to build an infrastructure during the planning process
- If a new awardee is unaware of where there local LLC is located, they will be directed to them.
- IN is one of the few states that already have an infrastructure like the LLCs available and already in place.

**Ninth.** Questions about the RFS Process

- Do we redirect the coalitions to the LLCs and is it a requirement of the LLCs to be there?
- Is there LLC staff in place for SPF-SIG demands?
- The grant review workgroup needs to discuss whether the grant should be a competitive grant process for the implementation grant once the planning grants have been distributed

1. Ex: 20 planning grants are distributed, through a competitive process you are only able to fund only 10 implementation grants?

**Tenth.** Required Costs for counties to run a coalition

- Must have 1 FTE and a clerical out of budget
- Must have an evaluation, and TA (contracted w/ PRC if they want)

**Eleventh.** Competitive process

- Eric suggested One or 2 years if it's a lo capacity community in the planning process
- Paula 12-18 months with a quarterly review during the planning phase.
- Resist the temptation to assign point values
- Through ITPC grant review process they have the strategic plan as one of the benchmarks

- Barber: Do we want to mirror the process of 5 year CSAP process as far as how the grants were proposed to the states?

**Twelfth. ICJI and LLC report**

- The LLCs last year changed the statewide plan to address the SPF
- Data collection for Part time staff is a 2-3 month process in Dekalb County. Return rate of surveys is 380. The comprehensive need process took a total of 6-8 months as a part time coordinator.
- The SPF is not new to the LLCs and they have been working with it and the data collection piece for a year

**Thirteenth. IPRC Report**

- Prev-Stat: a data warehouse, gives a data review of all 92 counties
- CSAP archival data maps of the county available
- Counties are able to do comparative rankings against the state and the nation
- IPRC Provides customized reports for counties
- Staff expertise and trainings available

**Fourteenth.**

- Bob Levy disagrees with the idea of competitive grants, if counties are not meeting the benchmarks then they should just be denied funding
- The LLC will still be able to apply
- Sonya suggests that some of the LLCs never touch the money because they are not 501-c-3's so discretion will be made.
- ICJI will be able to follow coalitions month to month by their fiscal spending to track for struggling early on and intervene

**Fifteenth. Voting**

- *Jason H. Motion to selection of target priorities meth, alcohol, cocaine and percentage rates- Motion approved*

1. Eric W. Alcohol 18-25 years- 6 measures included

- Used rate/number- in order to address the hi/hi contrib./need
- UCR data used
- 33% do report data
- the UCR data can disadvantage the counties that do not report
  - needs to push the counties, to start reporting
  - it is the most uniform measure of county level data
- Alcohol: lake county at the top of the list (10 points)

- Demographics were taken into consideration for the data collection,, meth was highlighted among young black males because it was statistically sig, written into the SEOW report
2. Cocaine & Meth: focused on use
- The number of arrests for possession
  - Marion #1 Cocaine
  - Vanderburgh #1 Meth
  - Counties that may rank in the top 10% in more than one priority will be restricted to applying to for only funding one of those priorities, however the data for the other priorities can be used to support other funding mechanisms.
  - SEOW suggests that there be restrictions on the types of outside data that is submitted to the grant review team (ex: treatment data can skew a county)
  - UCR data is the basis- possession, arrests there needs to be one uniformed set of data
3. This information will be put in the RFS
- Motion to accept the allocation track as laid out in the SPF-SIG Target Priorities written by Dr. Wright*
4. 2 tier process of the awards process
- limit the months of the planning phase to 18 months turn
  - had to receive approval to go on to the second phase
5. PIRE: CSAP really wants to evaluate the process, not the outcomes necessarily during the planning process
- *Planning grant will be written from a 6mo to an 18mo*
  - LLCs and PRC will provide trainings and address w/ early interventions when problems arise this will be written in to the SPF-SIG report

*Meeting Adjourned*